

RE: Stormwater Technical Team Call Highlights (Aug. 13th call)

Scheffler, Linda to: 'Laura Jones', Carl Stivers', Kristine Koch, Scheffler, Linda

08/20/2007 04:29 PM

Andy Koulermos, Amanda Shellenberger, Amanda Spencer
Cc:, Christine Hawley, "Sanders, Dawn", Gene Revelas,
Jim McKenna, Jessica Pisano, "Scheffler, Linda",

In our tech call we discussed including the GE and Port monitoring locations in the data summary tables. I just received a copy of the GE April 2007 Stormwater Monitoring Report prepared by AMEC. AMEC representative informed me that two storms have been sampled at the site to date. This report represents the first event, during which samples were collected only from the north yard sampling location, as flow volume wasn't sufficient to sample from the south yard. For the second event, equipment at the north yard location failed, and samples were collected only from the south yard sampling location. Data for the second event is just starting to come in.

GE intends to collect 3 more storm events at both locations this fall.

----Original Message---From: Laura Jones [mailto:ljones@integral-corp.com]
Sent: Friday, August 17, 2007 10:23 AM
To: Carl Stivers; Koch.Kristine@epamail.epa.gov;
Scheffler, Linda
Cc: Andy Koulermos; Amanda Shellenberger; Amanda
Spencer; Christine Hawley;
Sanders, Dawn; Gene Revelas; Jim McKenna; Jessica
Pisano; Scheffler, Linda;
LaFranchise, Nicole; Rick Applegate; Bob Wyatt;
TARNOW Karen E
Subject: RE: Stormwater Technical Team Call
Highlights (Aug. 13th call)

Hi - In response to Carl's question, I have requested a query of the database for all stormwater events to answer the question about the frequency of detects of phthalates in laboratory and field blanks. I expect to receive the query late today and will send an e-mail to this group on Monday or Tuesday.

Laura

Laura L. Jones
Managing Scientist
Integral Consulting, Inc.

319 SW Washington St, Suite 1150

Portland, Oregon 97204 Cell: 503.539.1723 Phone: 503.284.5545

Fax: 503.284.5755

ljones@integral-corp.com
www.integral-corp.com

IMPORTANT NOTICE: This email communication is

confidential and may contain

legally privileged information intended only for the addressee. Do not

read, copy or disseminate this e-mail message unless you are the intended

recipient. If you have received this message in error, please delete all

copies and notify the sender immediately at

ljones@integral-corp.com. Thank

----Original Message----

From: Carl Stivers [mailto:cstivers@anchorenv.com]

Sent: Thursday, August 16, 2007 1:56 PM

To: Koch.Kristine@epamail.epa.gov; Scheffler, Linda Cc: Andy Koulermos; Amanda Shellenberger; Amanda

Spencer; Christine Hawley;

Sanders, Dawn; Gene Revelas; Jim McKenna; Jessica Pisano; Scheffler, Linda;

Laura Jones; LaFranchise, Nicole; Rick Applegate; Bob

Wyatt; TARNOW Karen E

Subject: RE: Stormwater Technical Team Call Highlights (Aug. 13th call)

Stormwater Technical Team -

I was hoping others could weigh in on this issue raised by the City and see

where we stand. If we cannot resolve this additional change via email, it

will have to wait until our next call on August 23rd, because that was our

collective next available time to all meet to discuss anything.

I'd like to avoid waiting that long if possible, so any feed back you can

give via email would be most appreciated. So far we have heard from $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Kristine}}.$

My take on this issue is that we conducted phthalate stormwater sampling at

11 stations (more than the 2 stations for pesticides). I looked at the

detect rates for phthalates in the Batch 1 stormwater data, and phthalate

detection rates were generally above 50% at these stations with a few

exceptions. Assuming that these are truly detections and not blank $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right)$

contamination, it seems like we would be filling more

data gaps for pesticides than we would be creating for phthalates by making the changes that we agreed to at the conclusion of the last call.

Laura - Do you know whether we got a lot of stormwater field or lab blank contamination for phthalates? That would be a good way of checking whether the high level of phthalate stormwater detects are suspect.

Thanks.

Carl

Carl Stivers Anchor Environmental, L.L.C. 23 South Wenatchee Avenue, Suite 120 Wenatchee, WA 98801 Phone: 509-888-2070 Fax: 509-888-2211 cstivers@anchorenv.com This electronic message transmission contains information that is intended for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, please be aware that any disclosure, copying distribution or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please notify us by telephone at (206) 287-9130, or by electronic mail, cstivers@anchorenv.com.

----Original Message---From: Koch.Kristine@epamail.epa.gov [
mailto:Koch.Kristine@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 14, 2007 2:52 PM
To: Scheffler, Linda
Cc: Andy Koulermos; Amanda Shellenberger; Amanda
Spencer; Christine Hawley;
Carl Stivers; Sanders, Dawn; Gene Revelas; Jim
McKenna; Jessica Pisano;
Scheffler, Linda; Laura Jones; LaFranchise, Nicole;
Rick Applegate; Bob
Wyatt; TARNOW Karen E
Subject: RE: Stormwater Technical Team Call
Highlights (Aug. 13th call)

All - here are my thoughts.

I think that it is more important to get the

pesticide data rather than the phthalate data. Where any data for any parameter is insufficient, then it should be considered for additional data needs in the 8/23 meeting.

Kristine Koch
Remedial Project Manager
USEPA, Office of Environmental Cleanup
1200 Sixth Avenue, M/S ECL-115
Seattle, WA 98101
(206)553-6705
(206)553-0124 (fax)
1-800-424-4372 extension 6705 (M-F, 8-4 Pacific Time, only)

"Scheffler,

Linda"

<LindaSC@BES.CI.

То

PORTLAND.OR.US> 'Carl Stivers'

<cstivers@anchorenv.com>, Amanda

08/14/2007 12:46 Shellenberger

PM

<ashellenberger@anchorenv.com>,

Amanda Spencer

<aspencer@ashcreekassociates.com>

, "Sanders,

Dawn"

<DAWNS@BES.CI.PORTLAND.OR.US>,

Jim McKenna

<Jim.McKenna@portofportland.com>,

"Scheffler,

Linda"

<LindaSC@BES.CI.PORTLAND.OR.US>,

TARNOW Karen E

<TARNOW.Karen@deq.state.or.us>,

Andy Koulermos

<akoulermos@newfields.com>, Laura

Jones

<ljones@integral-corp.com>,

Kristine

Koch/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,

"LaFranchise,

Nicole"

<Nicole.LaFranchise@portofportlan</pre>

d.com>

CC

Jim McKenna

<Jim.McKenna@portofportland.com>,

Jessica Pisano

<jpisano@anchorenv.com>,

Christine

Hawley

<chawley@integral-corp.com>, Gene

Revelas

<grevelas@integral-corp.com>, Bob

Wyatt

<rjw@nwnatural.com>,

"Applegate,

Rick"

<RICKA@BES.CI.PORTLAND.OR.US>

Subject

RE: Stormwater

Technical Team

Call Highlights

(Aug. 13th call)

Team,

After we left our call, Dawn and I realized an additional consideration that should have been discussed as part of the reprioritization between

organochlorine pesticides and ${\tt PAHs/phthalates.}$

Pesticides and phthalates

were the two analytical groups that were not slated for analysis in all

stormwater composites because 1)pesticides were not likely to be detected in $% \left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{ 1\right$

stormwater at concentrations that may be significant and 2)there was a high

likelihood that phthalate results could be qualified by field or lab

contamination of samples. We discussed relying more heavily on the sediment

trap samples to evaluate these parameters.

With the proposed shifts, we may be sacrificing phthalate data for

pesticides. Are we comfortable with the remaining data set for phthalates?

From: Carl Stivers [mailto:cstivers@anchorenv.com]

Sent: Tuesday, August 14, 2007 11:37 AM

To: Carl Stivers; Amanda Shellenberger; Amanda Spencer; Dawn Sanders; Jim McKenna; Scheffler, Linda; TARNOW Karen E; Andy Koulermos; Laura Jones; Koch.Kristine@epamail.epa.gov; LaFranchise, Nicole Cc: Jim McKenna; Jessica Pisano; Christine Hawley; Gene Revelas; Bob Wyatt; Rick Applegate Subject: Stormwater Technical Team Call Highlights (Aug. 13th call)

Stormwater Technical Team -

The Stormwater Technical Team (EPA/DEQ/LWG) discussed LWG's proposed approach for handling stormwater sediment trap samples yesterday. Here the meeting highlights and action items. As always, please let me know if I missed something. It was agreed that the next call would be on August 23 at 1 pm. The technical team agreed to the LWG proposed approach for sediment trap analyses including the following specific points:

Reduce the mass of sample used for TOC analysis (from 1 gram to $\,$

 $0.1 \ \mathrm{grams})$, to provide more mass for chemical analyses

Use catch basin sediments collected from select locations for $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right)$

field and laboratory QA/QC analyses

In addition, the technical team agreed to the following changes in the LWG proposed analysis prioritization approach:

Use sample mass proposed for PAH/phthalates analyses for

organochlorine analyses instead at stations WR-123 (Schnitzer $\,$

Slip), WR-14 (Chevron Transportation), WR-161 (Portland Shipyard),

WR-147/148 (Gunderson)

Use sample mass proposed for PCB analyses for organochlorine $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right$

analyses instead at station OF-49 (City - St. Johns Area)

(Note that the LWG needs to obtain formal Exec. committee approval for these changes. We will notify the stormwater tech. team if LWG Exec.

cannot approve these changes for some reason.)

It was also agreed that the next call would discuss the sample completion information and whether it meets the original FSP objectives and to what

extent this indicates a need for additional fall sampling.

To prepare for this discussion, the LWG agreed to obtain sample completion

information on the T-4 stormwater stations from the Port and on the GE site

stormwater sampling from DEQ. In addition, the LWG intends to summarize the

percent detects for the Batch 2 and 3 stormwater composite data and, if

possible in time, have this available for the next call as well.

It was also agreed that at the next call the group would start to talk about methods for calculating stormwater loads based on the program data.

Thanks.

Carl

Carl Stivers Anchor Environmental, L.L.C. 23 South Wenatchee Avenue, Suite 120 Wenatchee, WA 98801 Phone: 509-888-2070 Fax: 509-888-2211 cstivers@anchorenv.com

This electronic message transmission contains information that is intended for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, please be aware

that any disclosure,

copying distribution or use of the contents of this information is

prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error,

please notify us by telephone at (206) 287-9130, or by electronic mail,

cstivers@anchorenv.com.

From: Carl Stivers Sent: Monday, August 13, 2007 8:50 AM Sanders'; Jim McKenna;

To: Amanda Shellenberger; 'Amanda Spencer'; 'Dawn

'Scheffler, Linda'; 'TARNOW Karen E'; 'Andy Koulermos'; 'Laura Jones';

'Koch.Kristine@epamail.epa.gov'; 'LaFranchise,

Subject: RE: Stormwater Sediment Trap Sample Handling

and Analysis Methods

Stormwater Tech Team -

The text below was also supposed to be provided to you with the two execl

tables that were sent around previously. Again, $\ensuremath{\mathsf{my}}$ apologies for not

getting this to you sooner. I will go over the contents of the text at the

start of the call at 9 am (in a few minutes).

The sediment trap samples are summarized on the spreadsheet titled

"Stormwater Outfall Sed Trap Sample Mass Analytical Aliquots" prepared by

Aliquots" prepared by the LWG. It includes wet weight, percent solids, dry weight, and a

potential scheme for analysis for each sediment trap sample and the catch

basin sediments. Since the sample mass was limited from the sediment trap

stations, catch basin sediments at some locations were collected for

potential use as laboratory quality control samples (e.g.

matrix spike/matrix spike duplicate samples for organics and matrix

spike/laboratory duplicate samples for metals and TOC, TSS) and field

quality control samples (field duplicates). The approach detailed in the

sediment trap spreadsheet includes the use of the catch basin sediments as

Two relevant issues that developed during analysis are summarized below:

The two laboratories [CAS and Vista (formerly Alta)] that will be

conducting the analyses were contacted to confirm receipt of $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left($

 $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right) +\left($

indicated that to meet our low detection limits the minimum sample $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right$

weights required for analysis for organic parameter groups were

 $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right) +\left($

discussions with these labs or the information in the FSP and $\,$

QAPP. The attached spreadsheet assumes the $\operatorname{minimum}$ sample masses

for PCB congeners, organochlorine pesticides, PAHs/phthalates,

metals, and herbicides in dry weight.

When conducting the total solid analysis, CAS did not use the

minimum sample mass (1g) for most samples. CAS was notified about

the limited sediment available from the sediment trap samples and $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right)$

was requested to use the minimum sample mass; however, the analyst $\,$

who weighed the samples for the analysis consumed more than the $\,$

 $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right) +\left($

includes the actual weights used for total solids measurements.

Two separate schemes were developed in the Analytical Aliquot spreadsheet.

The first scheme details sample aliquots for each individual sample as a

stand-only sample (i.e., field replicate samples are considered to be a $% \left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{$

different sample than its parent sample) and the second scheme details $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left($

sample aliquots where field replicate samples are combined with their parent

samples as one stand-alone sample to help increase available sample mass for

analysis. Combining the field replicates is currently our recommended

approach in concert with obtaining field and lab QC from catch basin

sediment samples as noted above.

Both schemes were developed by calculating the dry weight from the percent

solids measurements, subtracting out the actual wet weight mass used for the

percent solids, TOC, and metals (if applicable) measurements, and

calculating other aliquots for analysis. The aliquots were assigned in this

spreadsheet based solely on the priority of analytes from the FSP. There

are numerous options for each sample for distribution of sample mass for $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) =\left(1\right)$

analysis. This spreadsheet was developed for use by the stormwater tech

team for discussion purposes to determine the approach for each sample.

Obviously, the approach could vary sample by sample by reducing the sample

size one of the analysis and consuming the remaining sample for another $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right)$

parameter group (e.g.

reduce sample mass extracted for PAHs/phthalates to provide sample mass for

metals analysis (3.5 g for metals will result in 2X DL). Also, note that

while organics are extracted on a dry weight basis as noted above, metals

will be extracted on a wet weight basis. A minimum of 7g wet weight is

necessary for this analysis to meet project MRLs. Sample aliquots in the

table show wet/dry mass needed for metals analysis (based on a sample's

total solids content); dry weights were used for ease of calculation to

determine sample mass remaining for analysis.

Also, a procedural recommendation is that all of the remaining analytical

aliquots will be created at one time so we know the sample is well

homogenized and any issues with discrepancies in the amount of total sample

(although we expect such discrepancies will be small) can be resolved then

before the samples are extracted.

The second spreadsheet titled "Stormwater Summary," details each sample's

expected sediment detection limit factor; the level of detection will be

elevated by the number presented in each cell based on limited sample

volume. For example, a value of 1 means the target DL will be met and a $\,$

value of 2 means the actual achieved DL will be two times higher than the

target DL. We have layered on top of this spreadsheet a color coding

reflects the percentage of time each analyte group was detected at that

station for the Batch 1 stormwater data.

While Batch 1 results do not provide an indication of detection frequency

for the entire stormwater data set and some stations were not sampled in

Batch 1, it is the currently available data set with which we can start to

understand the frequency of detections in stormwater. The summary table is

intended to help determine where we have or are likely to have data from

either sediment traps and/or stormwater samples. For example, the table

shows where we have a complete absence of information (no detection limit

factor for sediments and no coloring for stormwater), a limited amount of $% \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) =\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) +\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{$

data (large detection limit factor sediments and light coloring for

stormwater), and where we have an analyte group that is likely covered by

both sampling methods (small detection limit factor for sediments and dark coloring for stormwater).

The Stormwater Technical Team asked for the LWG to propose a method for $\,$

sediment trap sample handling. In summary, per the above discussion, we are

proposing to recommend to EPA/DEQ members of the Stormwater Technical Team the following:

Follow the priority order of analyses as previously agreed upon

and detailed for each station in the $\ensuremath{\mathtt{EPA}}$ approved Stormwater $\ensuremath{\mathtt{FSP}}$

Combine field replicate samples into one samples available at some

locations to achieve a higher sediment volume for analysis and to

obtain data no more analyte groups at these locations $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1$

Use catch basin sediments collected at the locations noted in the $\,$

 $\mbox{ detailed spreadsheet for field and laboratory $\tt QC$} \label{eq:qc}$

PCBs appear to be the most important chemical from an in-river risk

perspective. This approach will allow us to obtain PCB data for the

majority of sampling locations (sometimes at elevated DLs), which is likely

to be supported by a substantial body of detected data in stormwater

samples. The approach will also allow us to obtain PAH/Phthalate and

Organochlorine pesticide data for those sites where these are the next $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right) +\left($

highest priority analyte. (Note the sequence of the $\operatorname{second}/\operatorname{third}$ priority

analytes varies across the sample locations.) Across all sites, limited data
will be obtained on third priority and higher

will be obtained on third priority and higher analytes.

Carl Stivers
Anchor Environmental, L.L.C.
23 South Wenatchee Avenue, Suite 120
Wenatchee, WA 98801

Phone: 509-888-2070 Fax: 509-888-2211

cstivers@anchorenv.com

This electronic message transmission contains information that is $% \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) =\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) +\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) +\frac{1}{2}\left($

intended for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you

are not the intended recipient, please be aware that any disclosure,

copying distribution or use of the contents of this information is $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right$

prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error,

please notify us by telephone at (206) 287-9130, or by electronic mail,

cstivers@anchorenv.com.

From: Amanda Shellenberger
Sent: Wednesday, July 25, 2007 3:45 PM
To: 'Amanda Spencer'; 'Dawn Sanders'; 'Jim McKenna';
'Scheffler, Linda';
'TARNOW Karen E'; Carl Stivers; 'Andy Koulermos';
'Laura Jones';
'Koch.Kristine@epamail.epa.gov'; 'LaFranchise,
Nicole'
Subject: Stormwater Sediment Trap Sample Handling and
Analysis Methods

Stormwater Tech Team -

Good News! The Stormwater Sediment Trap Sample Handling and Analysis
Methods were APPROVED with no changes by the Exec.
Committee today.
I've attached the two files for your review. Let's set up a conference call to discuss. Please email me with your potential availability. The best times for Carl and me are August 6th, 8th, or 9th anytime.

Amanda Shellenberger, P.E. Anchor Environmental, L.L.C 1423 3rd Avenue, Suite 300 Seattle, WA 98101 Direct Line: (206)903-3371 Office Line: (206)287-9130 Fax: (206)287-9131

This electronic message transmission contains information that may be

confidential and/or privileged work product prepared in anticipation of $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right)$

litigation. The information is intended for the use of the individual or

entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, please be aware

that any disclosure, copying distribution or use of the contents of this

information is prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission

in error, please notify us by telephone at (206) 287-9130, or by electronic

mail, ashellenberger@anchorenv.com.